

Community Planners Committee

Planning Department • City of San Diego
1010 Second Ave., Suite 1200, East Tower • San Diego, CA 92101
SDPlanninggroups@sandiego.gov • (619) 235-5200

CPC DRAFT MINUTES FOR MEETING OF OCTOBER 24, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Barry Schultz, Carmel Valley
Russ Connelly, City Heights
Pat Stark, Downtown
Michael D'Ambrosia, College Area
David Swarens, Greater Golden Hill
David Moty, Kensington/Talmadge
John Shannon, La Jolla
Noli Zosa, Linda Vista
Jeffrey L. Stevens, Mira Mesa
Lorayne Burley, Miramar Ranch North
John Nugent, Mission Valley

Jim Baross, Normal Heights
Dennis Campbell, North Park
Henish Pulickal, Pacific Beach
Jon Linney, Peninsula
Victoria Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo
Jon Becker, Rancho Peñasquitos
Wally Wulfeck, Scripps Ranch
Guy Preuss, Skyline/Paradise Hills
Robert Leif, Southeastern
Leo Wilson, Uptown

VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS: La Jolla, Mid-Way, Ocean Beach, Serra Mesa

Guests: Sandy Wetzels-Smith, Peter Hill, Tom Mullaney

City Staff/Representatives: Nancy Graham, Tony Kempton, Patricia Duenas

NOTE: *The sign-in sheets provided at the entrance to the meeting are used to list CPC Representatives, guest speakers, and staff present at the meeting.*

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair David Moty called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and proceeded with roll call.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

Scott Shipman, discussed marijuana manufacturing and growing facilities that were recently approved by the City Council. Kathleen Lippett, representing San Diegans for Safe Neighborhoods, expressed that the process for vetting the marijuana initiative was neither open nor transparent. Tom Mullaney, who started the Friends of San Diego fifteen years ago to consider growth and quality of life issues, said that neither the Mayor nor, in particular the former councilmember in his district, listened to his planning group when adopting the Uptown Community Plan. Jim Baross mentioned the 6th CicloSDias Open Street Day Event and shared that some roads would be closed to vehicular traffic but open to anybody on a non-motorized wheel device.

3. MODIFICATIONS AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

With no objections, chair Moty approved the agenda.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JULY 25, 2017:

Due to the fact that many members did not receive the minutes in digital form, approval was carried over until November's meeting.

5. PARKING ADVISORY BOARD – Information Item

Jeffrey Stevens, CPC representative to the Parking Advisory Board, discussed the board's attempts to develop strategies to increase parking in the City. One change that was adopted this year included amendments to the municipal code for angled parking, which facilitates converting streets with parallel parking to angled parking. Since adoption of the amendments in July, the board has been working with City staff from Uptown, Downtown and Mid-City in old and newly identified locations to implement angled parking through a streamlined process. The three planning areas hope to convert a total of twenty blocks to angled parking. For those interested in converting to angled parking, Jeffrey referred parties to Tanner French, Sr. Traffic Engineer at TFrench@sanidiego.gov.

Another issue discussed was being ticketed for parking in your own driveway. A solution the board came up with was for people to pay an administrative fee for a parking permit that allowed parking in your driveway. It is yet to be reviewed by the City Attorney.

The final idea discussed is a plan to institute a payment plan for paying tickets. A similar plan, under State Assembly Bill 503 would accomplish the same goal. Board comment followed.

6. EMERSON & EVERGREEN CODE INTERPRETATION – Information Item

Jon Linney, Peninsula chair, discussed how Peninsula residents and planning board members became aware of a development at the corner of Emerson and Evergreen appearing higher and out of scale than surrounding development. The community rallied and involved the planning board and the city in reviewing this project. City review identified an issue with FAR. The City required the owner to reduce the square footage which resulted in the third floor being removed. Linney said that the development was originally allowed because Proposition D allows building height to be measured from the finish grade, not existing grade. This has allowed new developments to use this loophole to raise the existing grade with planters and extend building height to forty feet. The City response to this community outcry was to limit the base zone in certain multi-family zones in Peninsula to a thirty foot height limit. This allowed zone height in the coastal zone to be more restrictive than height under Proposition D. However, seven projects (a.k.a. Dirty 7) received development permits before the City passed the ordinance limiting zone height in the coastal zone. The City's utilization of Proposition D to measure height in the coastal zone has raised contention in the community. Though Peninsula has corrected this situation with a code amendment it can still occur in other communities. Board comment followed.

7. HOUSING COMMISSION REPORT – Information Item

Chair Moty identified Jenny Vanderhyde from the Housing Commission as available to answer questions. Moty expressed concerns that although housing targets were identified, the report neglected the need for supportive infrastructure, especially in old in-fill communities. Moty provided examples of existing infrastructure deficiencies such as water mains, schools, and parks.

Moty said that when approached by the consultants for the Housing Commission report he spoke to the infrastructure needs and that if density was going to be added that the infrastructure to service it should be added too. He expressed disappointment that his comments were not included in the report resulting in an inadequate summary of the local housing challenges. Moty also mentioned discussion about a bond for affordable housing and

questioned why there could not be one for infrastructure as well as was offered by SANDAG in the recent ballot measure. Moty suggested a carrot approach, whereby a pot of infrastructure funds to accompany DIF would be an inducement to accept added density.

Board comment followed:

Some board members questioned why San Diego needs to add density at all.

Barry Schultz discussed the housing challenge facing San Diego is focused on low and particularly moderate income people, and that market housing is not being serviced. For families with children who wish to stay in the community they grew up in finding housing is a challenge. Schultz criticized the Housing Commission report for espousing a trickle-down theory where just increasing the number of housing units would somehow bring down the price, which he thought was a fallacy. He said if increased density is to occur there has to be some confidence that units will be affordable to low and middle income segment. He said the report mentions all the impediments to developers' profit margins but does not mention what an appropriate margin is. He also said that affordable housing often comes with deficiencies in infrastructure. He said we need to balance the need for density with quality of life issues.

Other members expressed concerns that new infill projects coming into their communities are upwards of \$1 million and are out of reach of the people needing housing the more.

Further comments tended to focus on criticism for the report's lack of focus on infrastructure and transit-oriented development, disregard for the value that the community planning groups bring to the development process, concerns over the lack of community input collected in the report drafting, and disappointment that the report focused too much on the needs of the development community without demonstrating that less regulations would actually improve housing shortages or reduce housing prices. Some members expressed a willingness to accept more density but are wanting some assurances in the quality of development, which is the benefit the CPGs bring to the process.

In closing David Moty offered that centralizing planning, as the report recommended, would no longer be representative of the neighborhoods and would forfeit the benefit of local knowledge. He added that this would result in more community attendance and comment at Planning Commission, drawing out hearing time.

8. PLANNING DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION CHART – Information Item

Nancy Graham, Senior Planner, Planning Department reviewed the Planning Department organization chart. Nancy described the organization from top-down providing brief description for department directors and deputy directors. Nancy described some changes in department structure, for example that Mobility was moved into the Environmental and Policy Analysis group, as a lot of transportation impacts fall under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

9. REPORTS TO CPC:

- Staff Report: See #8
- Subcommittee Reports:
- Chairperson's Report: David Moty said that several planning groups asked him about bylaws issues. He suggested having the planning groups combine their bylaws issues into a central document that could be used for reference that could help prevent

reinventing the wheel and save time for planning groups dealing with bylaws issues

- **CPC Member Comments:** Noli Zosa asked for clarification regarding abstaining versus recusing. Nancy Graham responded that if a member has a direct economic interest then they should recuse and if you have a perceived conflict of interest then you should abstain and state a reason. She referred members to the Administrative Guidelines on this point. David Swarens reminded members that the Alternative Process is a process can be initiated by planning groups for projects that do not meet conventional City standards.

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING: NOVEMBER 28, 2017

The meeting was adjourned by Chair David Moty at 8:34 PM